

## REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action of January 24, 2008. With this response, the drawings are amended, claims 1-5 are amended, the specification is amended and all pending claims 1-5 are presented for reconsideration and favorable action. Applicants respectfully request that the specification be replaced with the enclosed, clean "substitute specification". No new matter has been added. Applicants also enclose an annotated version that illustrates the marked changes from the immediate prior version.

In the Office Action, the drawings and specification were objected to and rejected. With this response, the drawings and specification have been amended and it is believed that the rejections may be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, the claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. It is believed that the amended claims have overcome this rejection and it may be withdrawn. Applicant notes that the term "bat shaped" was objected to. This language was intended to refer to a bracket is positioned within the grooves at two ends of the big and small rollers and therefore cannot be seen from the outside. However, this has been amended to use the language "hidden bracket" instead.

The claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based upon Smith. With this response, claim 1 has been amended to include the feature that the, "hidden brackets, the long and short mandrels are assembled along the circumferential direction of the wheel as a single line." It is believed that claim 1 is patentably distinct from the Smith and Dean references. More specifically, in the configuration set forth in claim 1, the wheel rim is complete (being constructed as a whole circle) and in single line, therefore the support of the bracket is not exposed to the outside which are hid in the grooves at the two ends of the big drum-shaped rollers, while the wheel rim of Smith is constructed as two lines with complicated structure, the rim of the wheel is not continuous, which is constructed by two line wheels, in addition, as shown in the Figure 6 of Smith, the support 80,82 and 98 are exposed to the outside, and each roller is divided into three sections to mount the bracket. Therefore there are many large grooves in the rim of the wheel, which leads to the unstable of the movement of the wheel.

In regard to Dean, there are two supporting spaces at the middle part of the each rollers, and there is a large clearance on the rim of the wheel, the bracket of which is exposed to the outside as shown by the reference number of 172 in the figures.

Secondly, the supporting site of the roller of the present invention is not exposed to the outside, while that of the Smith and Dean are both exposed to the outside.

The result of the above difference between the present invention and the cited references leads to a number of points:

The advantages of the present claim 1 are : since the wheel rim is constructed by single line, it is in simple structure and is stable while running of the wheel, since the supporting site of the roller is not exposed to the outside, the dust or other dirty can not be entered into the wheels, and the wheel can run stably.

The disadvantages of the Smith are: since the wheel rim is constructed by two lines, it is in complicated structure and with big volume, the wheel is not stable due to the two lines of the wheel rim and that the supporting site is exposed to the outside, the dust etc can be entered into the wheel and affect the running of the wheel, the continuum of the wheel rim is obtained by two lines of the wheels.

Similarly, the disadvantages of Dean are: since there are two supporting spaces at the middle of each roller and there is big clearance on the wheel rim, the wheel is not stable and in complicated structure, it has many grooves, which leads to the difficulty of machining and assembling.

In view of the above amendments and remarks. It is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: Judson K. Champlin/

Judson K. Champlin, Reg. No. 34,797

900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319

Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

JKC:trs